

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-7, 10-11, and 13-19 are pending herein.

### I. The amendments may be permissibly entered under 37 C.F.R. 1.116.

Applicants are respectfully aware of the rules and limits to claim amendments after final rejection. Applicants respectfully believe that the amendments are relatively minor in scope and thus no new search is required. Therefore, the amendments may be permissibly entered after final rejection.

### II. Claim objections based on informalities.

The USPTO respectfully objects to claims 1, 5, and 13 because of formalities. Applicants respectfully thank the Examiner for his suggestions, which have been implemented.

### III. The claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

The USPTO respectfully rejects claims 1, 4-7, 10-19. Applicants respectfully thank the Examiner for his suggestion of displaying the results, which has been implemented in independent claims 1, 7, and 19. No new matter is introduced by these amendments. Support for the amendments can be found on page 17 of the present specification and in present Figure 7.

### IV. The anticipation rejections based on "More DOS for Dummies" by Dan Gookin (Copyright 1994).

The USPTO respectfully rejects Claims 1, 4-7, and 10-19 under U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Gookin. Of these claims, claims 1, 7, and 19 are independent claims. Claims 4 and 12 have been cancelled.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully note that the rejections are based on § 102(e), as indicated on page 5 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully believe that the USPTO

intended to reject the claims under § 102(b) as indicated in the previous Office Action. The remarks below are based on the belief that this is a § 102(b) rejection.

A. Gookin does not disclose extracting all the prescribed directory structure comprising the directory having the first name and the directory having the second name in the storage medium, as claimed in claims 1, 7 and 19.

Claim 1 claims in relevant part:

“searching the plurality of directory structures based on the first name and the second name so as to **extract all the prescribed directory structure comprising the directory having the first name and the directory having the second name in the storage medium; and** [.,.]

displaying at least a part of the prescribed directory structure extracted in the searching step,

wherein the directory having the second name is in the same hierarchy level as the hierarchy level of the directory having the first name.” (**emphasis added**)

Claims 7 and 19 claims similar limitations. No new matter is introduced by these amendments. Support for the amendments can be found in present Figure 7 and on pages 16-18 of the present specification. Regarding this limitations, it is respectfully not seen where Gookin discloses the claimed method quoted above.

Specifically, the USPTO respectfully alleges on page 4 of the Office Action that when the user types “C:\CD\123\DOM”, the user searches a plurality of directory structures based on the first name and the second name so as to extract the prescribed directory structure comprising the directory having the first name and the directory having the second name. Additionally, the USPTO respectfully alleges on page 5 of the Office Action that the “DIR” command can give the list of directory structure in DOS, and wildcard characters can be used to extract directories.

However, Gookin does not disclose extracting all the prescribed directory structures comprising a directory having the first name and the directory having the second name, as claimed in claims 1, 7, and 19. Additionally, Gookin respectfully does not disclose extracting all the prescribed directory structure comprising a directory having the first name

and a directory having the second name in the storage medium, wherein the directory having the second name is in the same hierarchy level as the hierarchy level of the directory having the first name, as claimed in claim 1. Instead, it is respectfully noted that Gookin discloses on page 159 that “normally, the DIR command displays all the files on the disk or in the current directory. However, you can direct DIR to display only certain files by using DOS’s wildcards.” But such “certain files” are not all the prescribed directory structures as claimed in claims 1, 7, and 19.

In contrast, present Figure 8 illustrates one possible embodiment of the claimed structure quoted above. As noted on page 17 of the present specification, a user can search a storage medium for directories named “IMGD1” in the level below the directory named “ImageDir”, and all the subdirectories in the hierarchy level below the directory with the name “ImageDir” are displayed. Thus, present Figure 8 shows one example of extracting all the prescribed directory structure comprising the directory having the first name and the directory having the second name, as claimed in claims 1, 7, and 19.

Thus, it is respectfully asserted that Gookin does not disclose all the limitations of claims 1, 7 and 19. Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that Gookin does not anticipate claims 1, 7, and 19.

#### B. The dependent claims.

As noted above, it is respectfully asserted that independent claims 1 and 7 are allowable, and therefore it is further respectfully asserted that dependent claims 4-6 and 10-18 are also allowable.

V. Conclusion.

Reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims is respectfully requested.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Please contact the undersigned for any reason. Applicants seek to cooperate with the Examiner including via telephone if convenient for the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By   
Daniel P. Lent  
Registration No. 44,867

Date: March 12, 2007  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115  
Customer No.: 23413